

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-38 are all the claims pending in the application.

***Formal matters***

Applicant thanks the Examiner for reviewing and initialing the documents in the information disclosure statements submitted on December 1, 2003, June 6, 2005, and May 26, 2006.

***Claim rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 5, 21-23 and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

***Claim rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's "Description of the Prior Art" (hereinafter APA) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0069317 to Chow.

Amended claim 1 recites the feature of a control device for switching a ring bus from a unidirectional bus capable of either sending or receiving a signal unidirectionally, to a bi-directional bus capable of sending and receiving a signal bi-directionally, when a memory module is replaced. Applicant respectfully submits that the APA does not teach or otherwise suggest this feature. Moreover, Chow does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable.

Claim 21 recites similar features to claim 1, and therefore is patentable over the APA and Chow combination for the same reason discussed above.

Claims 2, 15, 17, 19, 22, 33, 35, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over APA in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,586,291 to Lasker.

Independent claims 2 and 22 each recites features similar to claim 1 discussed above. Lasker does not cure the deficiency of the APA, and accordingly, claims 2 and 22 are patentable over the APA and Lasker combination. The remaining claims are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

Claims 5, 8, 16, 18, 20, 23, 26, 34, 36, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over APA in view of Lasker in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,411,539 to Funaba.

Independent claims 5 and 23 each recite features similar to claim 1 discussed above. Neither Lasker nor Funaba, nor the combination of Lasker and Funaba cure the deficiency of the APA. Accordingly, claims 5 and 23 are patentable over the APA, Lasker, and Funaba combination. The remaining claims are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

Claims 3, 6, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Chow in further view of Funaba. Claims 4, 7, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Lasker in further view of Funaba. Claims 9 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Chow and Funaba in further view of U.S. Patent No.

6,487,623 to Emerson. Claims 10 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Lasker and Funaba in further view of Emerson. Claims 11 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Lasker and Funaba in further view of Emerson. Claims 12 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Chow and Funaba in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0083255 to Greeff. Claims 13 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Lasker and Funaba in further view of Greeff. Claims 14 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Lasker and Funaba in further view of Emerson.

The remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above. The Examiner has applied Emerson as allegedly teaching that the short-circuit device is a FET switch, and has applied Greeff as allegedly teaching that the short-circuit device is a connector. Thus, neither Emerson nor Greeff cure the deficiencies of the AAPA, Chow, Lasker, and Funaba references in relation to the arguments made above with respect to the various independent claims. As such, the remaining claims are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin C. Kunzendorf  
Registration No. 58,308

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 27, 2007